

SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: May 17, 2002
TO: Ross Dunfee, Steering Committee Chairman
Tony Barrett, Department of Ecology
COPY: Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Members and Consultant Team
FROM: Jim St. John, DEA and Dave Moss, Tt/KCM
SUBJECT: **Summary of Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Meeting**
Moses Lake Conference Center
May 9, 2002 9:00 am – 2:30 pm
PROJECT: EASTERN WASHINGTON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
Stormwater Management Technical Manual *and*
Model Municipal NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program

Subcommittee Meeting Attendees:

John Hohman – Spokane County	Steve King – RH2 Engineering
Steve Worley – Spokane County	Steve Hansen – City of Spokane
Jocelyne Gray – JUB Engineers	Gary Nelson – Spokane County
Dave Moss – TetraTech	Jim St. John – DEA
Greg Lahti – WSDOT	Don Gatchalian – Yakima County
Nancy Aldrich – City of Richland	Khalid Marcus – Yakima County
Karen Dinicola – Ecology	Ryan Lyyski – City of Ellensburg
Michael Hepp – Ecology	Sandra Levey – Grant County PUD
Mary Shaleen-Hansen – Ecology	John Heinley – WSDOT

PURPOSE OF MEETING:

This meeting was held to gather the core subcommittee members and at-large members for:

- Discuss Updated Production Schedule; Review Key Issue Summary
- Second review of Chapter 2 (Core Elements), Chapter 5 (Detention and Infiltration Design), and Chapter 8 (Erosion and Sedimentation Control)
- Continued discussion of Issue Papers 1, 2, and 4
- Discussion of UIC requirements

AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING:

1. Review of Subcommittee agenda and summary from 4/12 meeting

2. Review latest schedule and status of key issues
3. Finalize Issue Papers 1 and 2
4. Brief review of Issue Papers 3 and 4
5. Review revised draft of Chapter 2 (Core Elements)
6. Lunch break
7. Short presentation by Ecology on status of UIC program update
8. Review revised draft of Chapter 5 (Infiltration and Detention Design)
9. Review revised draft of Chapter 7 (Erosion and Sedimentation Control)
10. Adjourn Subcommittee meeting

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

1. Dave Moss presented the agenda and a summary of the April meeting.
2. Dave presented the schedule for the next couple months and the following changes were made for the next meeting on May 23.
 - a. Move Introduction Review to 6/13.
 - b. Will post Chapter 6 and 8 on 5/13.
 - c. Will post Chapter 4 and Issue Paper 4 on 5/16.
3. Dave Moss reviewed each item on the key issue list that was handed out. The following changes were made to the key issues. A revised issue list will be presented at each meeting.
 - a. Karen Dinicola requested that some BMP selection guidelines for project sizes be in the manual.
 - b. Karen requested to add basin planning to optional guidance.
 - c. Chapter 5:
 - 1) Karen suggested calling this chapter "Flow Control Design".
 - 2) Karen suggested keeping downspout controls as on-site control.
 - d. Chapter 3:
 - 1) Issue resolved.
 - 2) Offsite analysis may be required for flow control exemptions.
 - e. Chapter 6:
 - 1) Michael Hepp suggested site specific data for infiltration design.
 - 2) Greg Lahti recommended avoiding requiring testing if not needed.
4. Nancy Aldrich requested more distribution of e-mail comments.

5. Include dates in Issue Paper footers, so readers can note the latest versions.
6. Issue Paper #1 Discussion:
 - a. Change Tacoma to 5,000 SF for 2002 Public Review draft.
 - b. City of Spokane has 6,000 SF threshold.
 - d. Clarify definition of residential.
 - e. Gary requested adding sidewalks to list of excluded surfaces, and applying thresholds to new PGIS only.
 - f. Gary doesn't want recommendations to conflict.
 - g. Need to clearly define how to define the PGIS area.
 - h. PGPS previously proposed as not a factor in Eastern Washington. Pollution concern is that fertilizers and pesticides are used in the summer when dry, but not in the winter during storms.
 - i. Committee decided to change to a single 5,000 SF threshold. Clarify what this includes, such as 4 to 5 homes - not including single family homes or asphalt roof.
7. Issue Paper #2 Discussion:
 - a. Requested to delete 72-hour storm and change to flow control design storm.
 - b. Leave definition of rural zoned areas to local jurisdictions.
 - c. Karen has concerns regarding size of flow exemptions for projects.
 - d. Karen requested examples of when flow exemptions would occur.
 - e. Nancy suggests deleting option 6 and 7 in Part A. Storing water for irrigation use would conflict with water rights. Several others agreed.
 - f. Snowmelt should not be included – use flow control design event.
 - g. Several requested to reinstate that only 2 of 3 requirements need to be met in rural exemption.
 - h. Define direct discharge – via piped system or manmade conveyance system.
 - i. Keep the 4 rivers suggested on the exempt list. Put out for comment this way.
 - j. Consider BMPs applicable with temperature control.
8. Issue Paper #3 Discussion:
 - a. Clarify discharge requirements when groundwater < 10 feet to seasonal high water table.
 - b. Concerns about allowable discharge method for moderate and heavy pollutant loadings.
 - c. Groundwater appears to be held to a higher quality standard than surface water.
 - d. Remove clay, till, or tight basalt aquifer – not allowed for drywells by Chapter 5.
 - e. Send comments to Tony Barrett (Ecology) and cc: the Manual subcommittee members.
 - f. Define source control options in memo.

9. Issue Paper #4 Discussion:

- a. Dave Moss to post comment replies from MGS to Spokane County on Monday.
- b. Karen said goal should be to capture 85% of the annual runoff.
- c. Greg was concerned about using 2 year peak flow rather than 6 month peak flow.

10. Chapter 2 was reviewed. Major discussion points were:

- a. Expand introduction to include items in general considerations slide:
 - Advisory or Regulatory
 - Rule Authorized or Requirement
 - Make regulatory items look different than advisory (Use font change or italics)
- b. Threshold Table 2.1 should be in permit. Add, "For those jurisdictions that don't fall under permit, the following table is an example. Consider putting Table 2.1 at the end of Chapter 2 or in the Appendix."
- c. Clarify the meaning of "redevelopment" and how much treatment should be done. Desire is to regulate redevelopment, but not choke it.
- d. Karen offers to have Jeff Killelea of Ecology review the section for Core Element #2 in relation to the proposed construction permit he is working on. Nancy requests copy of rainfall erosivity waiver comments received from Ecology – Karen noted that this is internal Ecology e-mail chain but she will check and send it out.
- e. Core Element #3 source control not required for residential.
- f. Core Element #5: explain fully dispersed – Gary Nelson and Steve Worley requested that a grassed percolation swale qualify as an oil control BMP.

11. Mary Shaleen-Hansen gave a presentation on the UIC Program to both subcommittees.

- a. 3 rules open for revisions. Primary rule – 173-218 WAC UIC Program. Proposed rule changes are:
 - make consistent
 - clarify language
 - incorporate Federal changes to definition of UIC wells
- b. Clarifying rule language by: updating rule authorization for new UIC wells, how to manage existing UIC, determine sources that will require permit, and waste fluid definition.
- c. Mary requested volunteers join advisory group and reviewers to comment on draft rule language (when it happens) on-line or through Ecology's web page.
- d. Subcommittee requested that advisory group assist in writing 1st draft ad work parallel to manual development.
- e. Don, Steve, Steve, Lloyd, and John volunteered. Others requested to contact Mary if interested.

12. Chapter 5 was reviewed. Major discussion points were:

- a. Section 5.2 Roof Downspout Controls – delete this section. Delete from BMPs. These lead to undersized facilities. Don't provide credits.
- b. Concern about siting infiltration on contaminated or unstable soils – add to 5.4.1.

- c. Concern about sediment clogging – add optional sediment trap prior to detention vaults.
 - d. Add maintenance for infiltration BMPs.
 - e. Add section on evaporation ponds.
13. Chapter 7 was briefly reviewed. Karen offered for Ecology to review this chapter and Core Element #2, and the group accepted this offer. Preliminary comments were requested by 5/23 with final comments by 6/13.
14. E-mail Mel Schaefer's comments on Issue Paper #4 to all.
15. E-mail Jim Harakas' comments on infiltration to committee.
16. Subcommittee requested to have Mel attend next meeting to assist in resolving design storms.
17. Steve and Nancy would like e-mail discussion between meetings. Decided to try this with definition of redevelopment. Greg will initiate this by Tuesday.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:

The **next meeting** will be at the Moses Lake Conference Center on **May 23, 2002**, from 9am to 3:30pm. The agenda will include:

- Review of Subcommittee agenda and summary from 5/9 meeting
- Review latest schedule and status of key issues
- Redevelopment considerations and discussion
- Present/discuss Issue Paper 3 – Drywells
- Present/discuss infiltration issues
- Present/discuss water quality storm and soil characterization
- Review Issue Paper 4 – WQ Design Storm
- Lunch break (30 minutes) – *bring your own if you wish*
- Review revised draft of Chapter 4 (Hydrologic Analysis and Design)
- Review revised draft of Chapter 6 (Water Quality Facility Design)
- Review revised draft of Chapter 8 (Source Control)

The following text is the notes from the flip charts (created at the meeting) from participant comments:

Issue Paper #1 – PGIS

- How does manual address redevelopment projects?
- Add "sidewalks"; add "new"?
- Define how to measure/calculate 5,000 SF; 10,000 SF, etc.
- PGPS - previously proposed as not a factor in eastern Washington
- use 5,000 SF for PGIS

Issue Paper #2 – Flow Control (Flow Control Design Event)

- Design Storm yet to be set
- Can "72-hour" be left off?
- Definition of "rural"?
(by each jurisdiction)
- ...such as...
- Consider incremental/individual impacts
- When does this occur?
- Storage could be a water rights issue/conflict
- Snowmelt still a question
- 4 rivers recommended - all dammed
- 2 central Washington rivers - ok for now
- "Direct Discharge" - define
- Which guidance controls?
Karen will check legal
- Consider BMPs that are compliant with temperature requirements
- Start with 4 rivers and 3 lakes

Issue Paper #4 – Water Quality Design Storm

- Why is 2-year used instead of 6-month?
- 85% of annual runoff?

Chapter 2 – Core Elements

- Advisory vs. Regulatory?
 - use different fonts
 - clearer introduction
- "Fate" of Table 2.1 - where?
 - include as example; locate later in document

- Redevelopment vs. New Construction?
 - e-mail discussion topic (Greg L.)
- How to deal with change of use?
- Delete reference/text re: thresholds
- Incorporate "prior edits" (e.g. water quality design storm, etc.)
- Core Element #6 - awaiting Issue Paper completion
- Basin Plan (part of Core Element #8)
- Move Chapter 2 Glossary to back
- Add sidewalks to be non-PGIS
- Consider renumbering sections
 - no more than 3 numbers, if possible
- "CORE ELEMENTS" it is!

Chapter 5 – Infiltration and Detention Design (decided to use this chapter name)

- Downspouts – pull this section out
- Various edits as marked on edit copy
- Add "5." to Tables/Figures
- Fencing – code reference only
- Check "Fig." references inside of figures
- Stormwater characteristics.... note extra sands, gravels
- Add maintenance for infiltration
- Add BMP for evaporation ponds

Chapter 7 – Erosion and Sedimentation Control

- no comments; Ecology to review and comment